DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 944 EA 022 493

AUTHOR McDermott, Kathleen R.
TITLE What Is the Role of the Administrator As an Evaluator of Instruction?
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

The role of the administrator as an evaluator of instruction is examined in this paper. Included are a definition of terms and discussions of the historical development and purposes of instructional evaluation. Evaluation methods such as observation, clinical supervision, evaluation instruments, self-evaluation, and student achievement scores are examined next, as well as the role of the administrator. A conclusion is that total instructional evaluation assesses the teaching process and student learning outcomes and involves subjective judgment. The principal is most often responsible for evaluating instruction, which creates dual roles of supervision and teacher support. (22 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR AS AN EVALUATOR OF INSTRUCTION ?

Kathleen R. McDermott

ED326944

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. R. McDermott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 493

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR AS AN EVALUATOR OF INSTRUCTION ?

Kathleen R. McDermott

This paper will investigate the role of the administrator as an evaluator of instruction. First, definitions of instruction, evaluation of instruction, measurement and evaluation will be reviewed. Of special importance is the distinction between measurement and evaluation. The historical development of evaluating instruction will then be reviewed. In addition to early stages of evaluation, current trends will be discussed. Views on the various purposes of evaluation of instruction will be cited. Evaluation is considered to be of two main types: formative and summative. These will be explained and their importance discussed. Several methods of evaluating instruction will be reviewed including observations, clinical supervision, evaluation instruments, self-evaluations, and student achievement scores. Then the role of the administrator in the evaluation of instruction will be discussed. This section focuses primarily on the principal, since he is the most frequent evaluator of instruction.

DEFINITIONS

Instruction is defined by Knezevich (p. 411) as "the process, usually involving teachers performing with or without special devices or materials, which seeks to promote or actually results in the acquisition of knowledge, skills (or special competencies), or attitudes by one or more learners."

Evaluation of instruction is defined by Ben M. Harris (p. 190) as "a set of processes rather than a single act or even a simple set of isolated acts."

EA 022 493

Sax (pp. 9-18) makes a distinction between measurement and evaluation. In defining measurement, he says that it "involves the assigning of numbers to attributes or characteristics of persons, objects, or events according to explicit formulations or rules." In contrast, Sax says that "Evaluation is a process through which a value judgment or decision is made from a variety of observations and from the background and training of the evaluator."

Howsman (pp. 184-185) also discusses measurement vs. evaluation. He says, "Tests and other forms of measurement and assessment are not evaluation - they are means of collecting descriptive data needed in the evaluative and decision-making processes." In addition, evaluation is viewed by Howsman as a "process that involves making judgments on the basis of evidence regarding the attainment of previously determined conditions or objectives."

According to Norman Gronlund (pp. 7-8), "From an educational viewpoint, evaluation may be defined as a *systematic process of determining the extent to which educational objectives are achieved by pupils.*" He further clarifies the two important parts of this definition. He says that "evaluation implies a *systematic process,* which omits casual uncontrolled observation of pupils." Secondly, he says that "evaluation always assumes that *educational objectives* have been previously identified." These predetermined goals are necessary in order to judge the extent of progress. Furthermore, he states, "This definition indicates that *evaluation* is a much more comprehensive and inclusive term than *measurement.*"

Kimbrough and Nunnery (pp. 188-189) indicate that various definitions of evaluation have emerged. First, "Evaluation in education emerged as *measurement.*"

Kimbrough and Nunnery stated that Stufflebeam and associates referred to the "*congruence definition*, in which evaluation is seen as the process of determining the degree of congruence between organizational goals and performance." Kimbrough and Nunnery also stated that Stufflebeam and associates referred to the "*judgment definition of evaluation*, in which evaluation is a process that links value, information, and decision-making situations in making professional judgments."

Knoll"s (p. 5) view is that "Evaluation is a judgmental role . . . the supervisor examines and judges teacher performance in order to determine its quality or fix its value."

HISTRORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATING INSTRUCTION

Rebore (p. 185) indicates that for the most part in this century the historical development in American Education of the formal evaluation of teachers includes three stages: "During the 1920s, the efforts were primarily centered around analyzing if a given teaching style correlated with the philosophy and psychology of William James or John Dewey. The second stage was more concerned with ascribing certain personality traits as being related to excellence in teaching. The final stage, which appeared in the 1960s and persisted through the 1970s, emphasized generic teaching behaviors that would be effective in all instructional settings."

Rebore (p. 186) states the following as being some more recent developments in evaluation: "The 'systems' approach to management, which has been used extensively by industry and received a big boost in the early 1960's when Robert S. McNamara advocated its use in the U.S. Department of Defense, shifted the emphasis

away from the traditional concept of teacher evaluation to the broader concept of employee appraisal management. Appraisal by objectives has become the touchstone phrase for the 1980s. This implies that an employee can be effectively evaluated only within the context of attaining certain preestablished objectives."

Greene (pp. 370-371) also discusses the historical development of evaluation. In early times, "moral and spiritual values held by the teacher were of utmost concern to those responsible for employing him and for evaluating his service." Secondly, with the introduction of professional school administrators, "the stress in evaluation was on conformity rather than on creativity." During stage three, "educators began to show greater consideration of the nature of the learning situation. Pupil-teacher relationships became important. . . .There was understanding that all teachers could not proceed in the same way with all children. Administrators became aware of individual differences among teachers and applied this awareness when evaluating competence." A fourth stage in evaluation emerged with the growth of strong teachers' organizations "which insisted upon the treatment of teachers as professionals." "The teacher was to share in the evaluative process by discussing the nature, standards and substance of evaluation, which was no longer to be regarded as an end in itself but as one step in a program of improvement in instruction." New dimensions in evaluation include "the skill to diagnose difficulties in learning and the ability to lead or work in a teaching team" and "the extent to which a teacher individualizes instruction." Greene further states, "the rating devise of the future promises to be a comparatively brief instrument that reduces key elements of good teaching into a few major headings. It will be administered informally in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and desire to improve the instruction of children."

PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

Greene (pp. 368-370) indicates that "The principal purpose of evaluation is to improve instruction in the broadest sense." However, he further states that "Evaluation does not mean that improved instruction will take place merely by telling employees that they are doing a good job, a mediocre job or a poor job." Greene identifies other purposes of evaluation as being to "identify and encourage the retention of effective personnel . . . using past performance as a basis for predicting future success . . . to meet legal requirements of the state or the governing board . . . granting of tenure . . . occasionally used for salary placement."

Knoll (p. 5) sees the purpose or objectives of evaluation as being "to rate the teacher's performance. It is assumed that a poor rating will motivate and encourage the teacher to make improvements in his or her performance."

Griffith (pp. 424-432) states that "the prime purpose of evaluation should be to promote the professional growth of the teacher so that he may in turn stimulate and guide the growth of his pupils in socially desirable ways. Its raison d'etre is its effect on a teacher's future work." However, he also feels that "Unfortunately school districts pay lip service to this ideal but fail to put it into practice." "The primary purpose of evaluation is the improvement of teaching." In addition, Griffith says "Evaluation is not an end in itself: it is a means to an end. It should be designed to bring about change in the classroom so that a teacher may become increasingly effective. It is a procedure for the improvement of the product, process, and goals of teaching."

Morphet, Johns, and Reller (p.535) also discuss the purposes of evaluation. They say that there is "a tendency to perceive evaluation only or primarily as an effort to provide answers to questions such as 'Did it work?', or 'Did it accomplish what it purported to do?'" However, they further state, "But more important in any effort that has as its goal the improvement of some aspect of education is determination of the *worth* or *value* of the effort. This, then, should be the primary focus of any evaluative endeavor."

Regarding the purpose of evaluation, Hoy (p. 267) states that "In cases where planning was adequate and detailed, evaluation takes on a very specific function: its purpose is to let the learner and teacher know whether or not the instructional objectives have been met and, if not, where remediation or review is necessary. Evaluation is perhaps as much an indicator of the success of teaching as it is of learning. Evaluation is feedback. Change is possible without it; improvement is not likely without it."

TYPES OF EVALUATION: FORMATIVE VS. SUMMATIVE

Two types of evaluation are discussed by Howsman (pp.184-185): Formative evaluation and Summative evaluation. Regarding formative evaluation, Howsman says that it "refers to the use of data to make a process or operation effective as it goes along. By being able to redirect the process as it progresses, the goal seeker has a greater chance of reaching his goal. If objectives will not be met, corrections can be made."

In contrast, Howsman (p. 184) says that "summative evaluation occurs at the conclusion of an act or process; it is terminal. Summative evaluations have a characteristic of finality. These evaluations are entered into records and are used as the bases of decisions. Teachers retain or lose their positions on the basis of summative evaluation. Student summative evaluations become grades, appear on transcripts and report cards, and affect decisions that others make about them."

Howsman (p. 185) states that "In general, teachers overuse the summative and underuse the formative evaluation processes."

DeRoche (p. 4) also explains the difference between the two types of evaluation. Regarding formative evaluation, he says that it "refers to evaluation that gathers and uses information during the process of doing something. It is on-going, requiring continual feedback for decision making and change along the way . . . I believe that principals and teachers benefit from feedback during on-going evaluation processes, when they can change or redirect something, rather than waiting for the completion of a program or project." Of summative evaluation, DeRoche says that it is "the typical end-of-the-year assessment used to determine the effects of a program, project, or procedure. It leads to one of three decisions at the completion of something - to continue it, change it, or cancel it."

McGreal (p.2) says the following regarding summative evaluations: "Traditionally, local school systems have emphasized the accountability or summative function of teacher evaluation. This traditional view has increasingly come into conflict with the instructional improvement orientation being encouraged and supported by such factors as the expanding number of tenured teachers, the increasing professionalism

of teacher-administrator groups, and the increased visibility of growth oriented supervisory models such as clinical supervision."

METHODS OF EVALUATING INSTRUCTION

OBSERVATIONS:

McGreal (p. 96) states that "Classroom observation is the most practical procedure for collecting formal data about teacher performance. The quality of observations and the ways supervisors collect and share data with teachers are major factors in the success and effectiveness of teacher evaluation systems." Regarding the administrator/supervisor and observation, McGreal states that "Training to improve observation skills is most effective when supervisors have already adopted an appropriate attitude about observation . . . believing evaluation is a cooperative effort of teacher and supervisor to improve instruction allows the supervisor to put observation into a proper perspective."

Harris (pp. 148-149) makes a distinction between the use of systematic observation techniques and the use of traditional annual "rating rituals" generally used by school principals. He states, "In the former, systematic procedures are followed to gather a variety of data, with analysis and interpretation processes of evaluation preceding any valuing or decision making. Rating scales in general use call for no such systematic procedures, no evidence is recorded, and therefore no explicit analytical and interpretive procedures are followed."

Gronlund (pp. 409-410) says that "Direct observation provides the only means we have for evaluating some aspects of learning and development . . . and it provides supplementary information concerning others." He identifies three observational techniques: anecdotal records, rating scales, and checklists. However, these are techniques which are primarily used by teachers.

In discussing observations, Griffith (p. 427) says, "the sample of classroom observations may not be representative of a teacher's total behavior. When comparing one *group* of teachers with another *group*, the number of observations necessary for a representative sample can be relatively small, but when relating a teacher's instructional activities to outcomes, a larger sample is required. Just how large is a perplexing problem."

Regarding observation, Hyman (pp. 23-26) says, "To observe is much more than mere seeing. Observing involves the intentional and methodical viewing of the teacher and students. Observing involves planned, careful, focused, and active attention by the observer. Observing involves all the senses and not just sight or hearing . . . observing is a critical task of the supervisor." Hyman also says that "when you observe, you can gather the key evidence you need for teacher evaluation." Furthermore, Hyman states that "The key is to remember that observing is an essential element in a sound supervision program. It provides the central data for feedback and evaluation procedures."

Evertson and Holley point out that "observations can provide information that may not be acquired through other kinds of inquiry. Other methods of measuring teacher competencies and student learning are also important, but classroom observation gives us a view of the climate, rapport, interaction and functioning of the classroom

available from no other source. Help in understanding and ultimately in improving instruction can come from seeing just how events take place in the classroom."

CLINICAL SUPERVISION:

A particular technique which utilizes observation is known as Clinical Supervision. In Lovell and Wiles (p. 169) they quote Cogan's definition of clinical supervision. It is the following: "Clinical supervision may therefore be defined as the rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance. It takes its principal data from the events of the classroom. The analysis of these data and the relationship between teacher and supervisor form the basis of the program, procedures, and strategies designed to improve the student's learning by improving the teacher's classroom behavior."

Lovell and Wiles (p.169) further state that "A critical component of the process is observation and analysis of teaching as a basis of feedback for teachers that can be used as a framework for change and improvement of performance. Emphasis is placed on objectivity in observation, analysis, and feedback for teachers, with both supervisors and teachers participating in the processes as colleagues. It is expected that teachers will have primary responsibility for evaluation and decisions on changes in teaching behavior with supervisors playing a helping, supporting, suggesting, and servicing function."

Smyth (p. 3) identifies what he feels is fundamental about clinical supervision. "At the heart is the aim of encouraging dialogue between and among teachers about actual teaching experiences, but in a way that enables questions to be asked about

taken-for-granted (even cherished) assumptions and practices, the formulation of alternative hypotheses for action, and the actual testing out of those hypotheses in classroom situations." Smyth (p.4) further indicates that the "centerpiece of clinical supervision still remains the 'conferencing' (i.e. non-judgemental discussions) between teacher and colleague."

Many authors have identified various phases of clinical supervision. For instance, Cogan (pp. 10-12) cites the following eight phases:

Phase 1. Establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship
Phase 2. Planning with the teacher
Phase 3. Planning the strategy of observation
Phase 4. Observing instruction
Phase 5. Analyzing the teaching-learning processes
Phase 6. Planning the strategy of the conference
Phase 7. The conference
Phase 8. Renewed planning

Lovell and Wiles (p. 171) list the five stages of clinical supervision which were identified by Goldhammer, and others:

1. Preobservation conference
2. Observation
3. Analysis and strategy
4. Supervision conference
5. Post conference analysis

However, Lovell and Wiles (p. 172) say that they think that it is "less restrictive to think of clinical supervision as an instructional supervisory behavior system with three interdependent dimensions: 1. Preobservation behavior, 2. Observation behavior, 3. Postobservation behavior."

Although Lovell and Wiles (p. 181) believe in clinical supervision as a "system for the delivery of help, support, and service to the teaching behavior system," they also list

what they believe are many pitfalls in the delivery of clinical supervision. The following is a pitfall which they mention which is directly related to evaluation: "Some organizations have yielded to the temptation to use 'clinical supervision' as a system for evaluating teachers for personnel decisions. Such a decision precludes the use of privileged information, can be threatening and can limit willingness to share problems and concerns, can put teachers in a role of dependency and inferiority, and can limit the hoped-for outcome of teachers' becoming better functioning and self-improving professionals."

In discussing clinical supervision, Cogan warns of the negative aspects. He says that "clinical supervision itself will be a long, demanding, and expensive process. The rationale also dictates that clinical supervision is much better not done at all than done with inadequate support or with less-than-expert supervisors."

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS:

According to Griffith (pp. 424-427) "Most evaluative instruments are check lists or rating scales which do not offer specific suggestions for improvement although they sometimes provide space for the evaluator to make brief notations." Griffith also says that "An evaluative form is basically a district's definition of what constitutes a good teacher. It lists the personal attributes and professional competencies assumed to be essential for teaching success. Since no research has established such a relationship, the validity of the instrument is suspect." Moreover, Griffith states "The evaluative instrument calls for subjective, qualitative judgments. Even when these judgments are converted into quantitative scores, there is no increase in objectivity and reliability. Subjectivity is merely quantified."

Medley, Coker and Soar (pp. 7-8) do not believe that research supports the use of rating scales. They says that "What a modern rating scale tries to do is to locate a classroom on a scale from one to five on a dimension of classroom behavior, such as orderly to disorderly . . . But neither past experience nor research offers much support for this procedure because teachers rated high on these dimensions do not typically produce greater pupil learning gains than teachers rated low on them. If we drew a number between one and five from a hat, the number would predict teacher effectiveness almost as well as one of these ratings, as far as we can tell." They further state, "According to research based on rating instruments, the widespread use of such ratings in efforts to improve the quality of teachers may be expected to have no effect."

SELF-EVALUATIONS:

Carroll (p. 180) sees benefit in self-evaluations. He states, "Surely one basic aim of faculty evaluation should be the study and improvement of teaching. It is in pursuit of this aim that various forms of self-evaluation contribute significantly to an overall evaluation strategy." Regarding self-evaluation, Carroll further states "Although self-evaluation can contribute useful data for administrative decisions by providing additional information and perspectives that may be unavailable from other sources, its greatest value continues to be for self-understanding and instructional improvement." In connection with the administrator's benefit from self-evaluation, Carroll (p. 199) says "By providing additional data and perspectives on teaching, self-assessment can contribute to the inferences and conclusions drawn in administrative decisions about teaching."

Neagley and Evans (pp. 176-177) indicate that "Evaluation is an essential process in the improvement of the learning situation. Self-evaluation, evaluation by peers, evaluation by supervisory personnel (which actually should be a peer relationship), and evaluation by pupils should all be encouraged." They further state that self-evaluations have been participated in for approximately forty years. "In this process, standardized evaluative criteria have been used which provide check lists for each aspect of the educational enterprise." Neagley and Evans think that "Any staff that spends six months to a year (longer if necessary) in an exhaustive evaluation of all aspects of their educational enterprise is bound to grow professionally. Individuals who see only accreditation as an objective in overall school evaluation are short-sighted indeed."

Morphet, Johns, and Reller (p. 553) also discusses the benefit of self-evaluation. He states, "Continuing self-appraisal or evaluation of perceptions and attitudes relating to education by board members, staff, and students, and even by parents and other citizens seems to be another essential. Constructive self-appraisals to which others contribute under favorable conditions should result in increasing the understanding of problems and needs in education in more effective contributions to their solution."

Greene (pp. 372-373) states that "Teachers themselves must share in developing standards for judging competence since they are the ones directly affected by any evaluative procedure." Greene also says, "It is proper that teachers should have a developing responsibility in the evaluative process." However, Greene sees problems with the evaluation of teachers by other teachers. He says, "Teachers are understandably reluctant to criticize or mention the inadequacies of their colleagues, and analysis of teaching ability requires special training that all teachers do not

have." Greene further states, "The values of peer interaction seem to lie more in the process of discussion of observed teaching or intervisitation than in formal evaluations. Great value can also be obtained from self-evaluation by teachers, but it must be pointed out that training is necessary for fruitful self-evaluation."

According to Griffith (p. 430), "Formal self-evaluation is rarely used. It is based on the premise that no teacher will begin to improve himself unless he is dissatisfied with his performance, a premise that seems unexceptionable."

McGreal (pp. 131-132) states that "Most of the inadequacies attached to self-evaluation are not weaknesses in the concept. Rather they result from the misunderstanding or misuse of the concept in school settings." In discussing the misuses of self-evaluation, McGreal mentions that "There is no follow-up, no discussion, no attention given to the completed document . . . *Like all sources of data, self-evaluation data are most effective when they are shared and discussed with someone else.* Another misuse is that "teachers compare their self-assessment rating with the rating made of them by their supervisor . . . This use of self-evaluation is counterproductive. It puts supervisors in an untenable position and promotes an atmosphere of conflict that is almost impossible to overcome."

However, on the positive side, McGreal (p. 132) says that "One successful use of self-evaluation occurs prior to the initial goal setting conference between the supervisor and the teacher. Even after initial training, teachers sometimes have difficulty finding an area of concern or interest that might serve as a basis for creating a goal. Using a form of ipsative or forced choice scaling, it is possible to focus a teacher's attention on specific aspects of teaching."

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT SCORES:

According to McGreal (pp. 129-130) "There appears to be general consensus as to the need and value of collecting student performance information, but the problem is how best to incorporate such a controversial source of data into the system. To maintain emphasis on instructional improvement that characterizes effective evaluation systems, an informal approach to monitoring and using student performance data seems most useful." McGreal points out that "In daily teaching, very natural and continuous collections of student performance are routine. They include such things as the monitoring of student response during questioning activities and guided practice and the grading of student homework assignments, quizzes, and tests. Certainly these methods are much less formal than standardized tests and less precise than specifically constructed teacher performance tests. Nevertheless, they still provide immediate feedback on student learning that teachers can use regularly to make instructional decisions."

Morphet, Johns, and Reller (pp. 554-555) discuss external tests and uniform state testing programs; the demand for these has increased because of "increasing concern about improving the quality of education for all students in every school." However, Morphet, Johns and Reller also state that there seems "to be valid reasons for concern about the heavy reliance on and current use in some states and local school systems of standardized achievement tests, most of which are norm-referenced." They indicate that these norm-referenced tests may have detrimental effects with children from bilingual homes. Morphet, Johns and Reller further state, "Other factors resulting in concern include the number of tests sponsored in secondary schools which overlap and may be extremely time consuming; the

tendency for that which is tested to be regarded as synonymous or of equal importance; the improper or limited use of results; the extreme belief by some in their validity, objectivity, and scientific quality; their impact on the study habits of students; and the control which they exercise on the curriculum and instructional procedures."

Griffith (p. 425) states "Laymen see no difficulty in evaluating teachers on the basis of what their students learn. To them evaluation is simply a matter of measuring what students know at the beginning of a school year and again at the end, and the difference between the two is a measure of the teacher's ability. If the students haven't learned, the teacher hasn't taught."

However, Griffith (p. 425) further discusses the above view. He says, "Teachers oppose this solution as simplistic. Admittedly it is possible to measure a knowledge of subject matter with reasonable accuracy. However, modern education is concerned not only with facts and skills but also with attitudes, habits, and appreciations which are not so easily measured. Besides, even the learning of facts and skills is dependent on many variables not under the teacher's control, including the intellectual ability, emotional stability, socio-economic status, and family backgrounds of the students. Even superior teachers achieve comparatively less with youngsters who are handicapped mentally, emotionally, economically, and socially. Moreover, some learnings may occur dispite poor teaching so that a teacher may be given credit for results for which he is not responsible."

ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR IN THE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION:

Lovell and Wiles (p. 239) state their views regarding the principal's role as an educational leader: "As instructional supervisors-administrative, they have a primary responsibility to coordinate the efforts to define and evaluate local school goals; plan, implement, and evaluate instructional programs to achieve those goals; attract, select, support, and facilitate the professional growth of staff members; evaluate and coordinate the work of professional personnel; and see that adequate and appropriate instructional materials, equipment, and facilities are provided . . . a principal not only needs formal authority from the organization to evaluate personnel, but also must have the competence and personal skills to do the job without creating faculty alienation, poor motivation, and inferior performance."

According to Lovell and Wiles (p. 210), "It is our assumption that personnel evaluation should be decentralized and, therefore, accomplished as close to the work as possible. This would indicate that teachers should be evaluated at the local school level with the school principal coordinating the process. However, we also believe that the central office supervision team should be actively involved."

Greene (p. 372) states, "The prevailing practice is for the teacher's immediate supervisor to evaluate him." However, he further states, "There are some visible signs, however, that the responsibility will soon be shared in some manner with others, who will include members of the teaching team, students and even representatives of the community. Even one's peers may be involved."

According to Greene (pp. 373-374), since the practice is to have principals evaluate teachers, this puts him in a dual role. The principal must "give the teacher support

and encouragement, positive suggestions for improvement, and opportunities to gain insights by visiting other classes; he must also suggest reading material and develop rapport and the desire for free interchange of ideas; however, he may also be called upon to document the inadequacies of a teacher, to rate a teacher as satisfactory or unsatisfactory." Furthermore, "The principal's duty in evaluating or rating teachers can impair the freedom of exchange between him and his staff by developing distrust or caution on their part. Thus in large school districts the assistant principals or visiting consultants who are removed from a rating role carry the major supervisory role, while the principal becomes the rating officer."

Griffith (423) also sees the principal as the usual evaluator. He states, "In all but the smallest school districts teachers are formally evaluated, usually by their principal, at the end of the school year. Some districts evaluate probationary teachers more often than tenured teachers and some do not evaluate tenured teachers at all. Generally teachers do not actively participate in the evaluation process; they are passive subjects."

DeRoche (p.6) also discusses the role of the principal in evaluation. He states, "The building principal has the major responsibility for formalizing the evaluation process. Legally the building principal is the chief administrative officer, the supervisor, and the decision maker. A principal's attitudes and procedures can make the evaluation program an enlightening, interesting, exciting venture or one that is frustrating, based on fear, and viewed negatively by those involved."

AUTHOR'S PERSPECTIVE

Evaluating instruction is many faceted. Not only should the process of teaching be evaluated, but also the end result of learning in the students. In fact, the primary purpose of evaluating instruction according to most sources has to do with determining if the goals and objectives of instruction have been met. Evaluation must be distinguished from measurement. While measurement is quantitative and involves assigning numbers to things and obtaining data, evaluation is a judgment process.

Historically, evaluating instruction has developed from evaluating the moral values of teachers, to emphasis on conformity, to emphasis on individual differences, to viewing the teacher as a professional.

The main purposes of evaluation in education are to improve instruction and to determine if goals and objectives are being met. Promoting professional growth is also a primary objective.

The two main types of evaluation are formative and summative. Formative evaluation is on-going and uses feedback for decision making and change. Summative evaluation is terminal and done at the conclusion of an act.

Several methods can be used in order to evaluate instruction. Observation can provide data, but it should be done in a systematic, planned manner. Clinical supervision's aim is to improve instruction by use of a cycle which includes at least a pre-observation conference, an observation, and a post-observation conference. Various evaluation instruments can be used to aid in the

evaluation of instruction, such as check lists or rating scales. It is important to realize that these instruments still call for subjective judgments. Self-evaluations can be useful in providing additional information to be used in instructional decision making. Student achievement scores also provide feedback information that can be used in the evaluation of instruction. However, due to the limitations of some students, their scores may not reflect the "teaching" that has been done. On the other hand, learning may take place even when the teacher is not the one responsible for it.

It seems that the principal is the person most often responsible for evaluating instruction. They evaluate teacher effectiveness and determine if instructional goals are being met. However, this puts the principal in a dual role, since he must also support and encourage the teacher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carroll, J. Gregory. "Faculty Self-Evaluation." In Handbook of Teacher Evaluation, ed. Jason Millman, 180-199. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.
This chapter is only about self-evaluations by teaching staff. Other parts of the book deal with additional ways of evaluating teachers.

Cogan, Morris L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.
This book deals only with clinical supervision. In the book, clinical supervision is conceptualized from the teacher's viewpoint.

DeRoche, Edward F. An Administrator's Guide for Evaluating Programs and Personnel, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1987.
This book covers the evaluation of all aspects of schools, such as instruction, leadership, effective teaching, curriculum, student activities programs, school-community relations, etc. A major focus is that evaluation requires cooperation of all school personnel.

Evertson, Carolyn M. and Freda M. Holley. "Classroom Observation." In Handbook of Teacher Evaluation, ed. Jason Millman. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.
This chapter deals only with classroom observation. The book covers many ways of evaluating teachers.

Greene, Jay E. School Personnel Administration. Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1971.
This book contains a chapter regarding the evaluation of personnel.

Griffith, Francis. Administrative Theory In Education: Text and Readings. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1979.
A text book with a chapter regarding the evaluation of teachers.

Gronlund, Norman E. Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching, 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971.
This is a text book which covers the principles of evaluation for good teaching. It is written with the aim of being of primary benefit to teachers.

Harris, Ben M., Supervisory Behavior in Education, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985.
This is a text book which covers many aspects of supervision as it relates to education.

Howsman, Robert B. "Current Issues in Evaluation." In Evaluating Administrative Performance: Current Trends and Techniques, ed. Elio Zappulla, 183-191. Belmont, California: Star Publishing Company, 1983.
This is a chapter regarding current issues in evaluation. It is contained in a book which covers current trends in many aspects of evaluating administrative performance.

Hoy, Wayne K. and Patrick B. Forsyth. Effective Supervision. New York: Random House, 1986.
This is a text book which outlines the theory and practice of supervision aimed at improving instruction.

Hyman, Ronald T. School Administrator's Handbook of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Methods. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
This book was written for supervisors and to be of practical use. It incorporates strategies, suggestions, examples and useable materials.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. and Michael Y. Nunnery. Educational Administration An Introduction. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.
A text book written for introductory courses in educational administration. It presents an integrated discussion of theory, knowledge and practice.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. 4th ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harper & Row Publishers, 1984.
This is a text book which is often used in courses for foundations of educational administration.

Knoll, Marcia Kalb. Supervision for Better Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1987
It is primarily about supervision as separate from evaluation, but one chapter discusses the differences between the two.

Lovell, John T. and Kimball Wiles. Supervision for Better Schools. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983.
This is a text book which contains a separate chapter on clinical supervision, as well as information regarding evaluation in other chapters.

Medley, Donald M., Homer Coker, and Robert S. Soar. Measurement-Based Evaluation of Teacher Performance. New York: Longman, 1984.
This book deals with the evaluation of the teacher. Several methods of evaluating teachers are discussed and critiqued.

McGreal, Thomas L. Successful Teacher Evaluation. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.
Teacher evaluation is the focus of this book. It covers building an evaluation system, types of teacher evaluation, training the staff, and implementing an evaluation system.

Morphet, Edgar L.; Roe L. Johns; and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
This is a text book in the area of educational organization and administration. It includes a chapter on evaluation and accountability.

Neagley, Ross L. and N. Dean Evans. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

A text book that aims at applying concepts of school supervision to daily teaching-learning situations.

Rebore, Ronald W. Personnel Administration in Education: A Management Approach. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1987.

A text book on personnel administration which contains a separate chapter on appraisal.

Sax, Gilbert. Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement and Evaluation. 2nd ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1980.

This is a text book with the primary goal of preparing students in education and psychology to understanding and appropriately use principles of measurement and evaluation.

Smyth, W. John. Learning About Teaching Through Clinical Supervision. London: Croom Helm, 1986.

A book which discusses clinical supervision in teaching.